

histories; defendants' phone and email records; and defendants' communications on 2 discriminatory media. See Dkt. 12. Plaintiff's requests are not timely. Plaintiff wrote his letter with his discovery requests a 3 mere three days before the discovery cutoff, and his motion was filed just two days before the 4 5 cutoff. See Dkt. 28. Pursuant to the Court's pretrial scheduling order, all discovery—including 6 the service of responses to requests to produce and the taking of depositions—was to be 7 completed by the discovery cutoff date. See Dkt. 24, at 1; accord Tate v. United States, No. CV159323FMOJPRX, 2017 WL 10543551, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 24, 2017) (to be timely, a 8 9 deposition must be scheduled before a discovery cutoff). 10 Plaintiff did not request an extension of the discovery cutoff before it expired and has not 11 provided good cause for additional time under the Local Rules. See Local Civil Rule 16(b)(6) 12 ("Mere failure to complete discovery within the time allowed does not constitute good cause for 13 an extension or continuance."). To the extent that he is making a belated request to extend the 14 discovery cutoff, his request is denied. 15 Plaintiff's motion for discovery (Dkt. 28) is denied. 16 Dated this 25th day of March, 2020. 17 18 Mora 19 J. Richard Creatura 20 United States Magistrate Judge 21 22 23 24